

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. The drawings were objected to. The specification was objected to. Claims 1-15 were objected to for informalities. Claims 1, 3-7, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,157,478 to Naiki et al. (herein "Naiki"). Claims 2, 8-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naiki. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,220,449 to Kuroda in view of Naiki.

Addressing first the objection to the drawings, that objection is traversed by the present response. First, the specification is amended at page 26, line 16, and page 35, line 15, to delete the symbols noted as not shown in the drawings. Further, a substitute Figure 11 is provided herein so that now Figure 11 recites the terms C1' and C2', to be consistent with the specification, and further reference numerals d, $\Delta X1$ and $\Delta Y1$ are now deleted from Figure 11.

In view of the above-noted amendments to the specifications and drawings, the objections to the drawings is believed to be traversed by the present response.

Addressing now the objection to the specification, the specification and abstract are amended to address the objections noted thereto, and to correct for other minor grammatical and idiomatic informalities.

Addressing now the objection to the claims, Claims 1-15 are amended to address the objections noted thereto, and particularly those claims are amended along the lines suggested in the Office Action. Claim 2 is amended slightly differently than suggested as claim 2 has changed the phrase "can be mounted" to --is mountable--. The other suggested claim amendments are incorporated by the present response.

Addressing now the rejections of claims 1, 3-7, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Naiki, the rejection of claims 2, 8-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Naiki, and the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kuroda in view of Naiki, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of the pending claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, each of independent claims 1, 12, and 15 is amended to further recite

wherein said plurality of holding and fixing locations are those from which a selection is made, whereby a location of said light-source part is determined according to the selection.

Each of independent claims 8, 13, and 15 is amended to further recite:

wherein a change of the mounting position of said second imaging optical system according to whether or not the transparent member is used is achieved by a selection of the mounting position of said second imaging optical system from among a plurality of predetermined locations.

Each of the pending claims is believed to clearly recite features neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

According to the claims as currently written, the position of the light-source part or the second imaging optical system is changeable by appropriately selecting one of the plurality of predetermined locations.

With reference to Figure 5 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the position of the light-source part can be changed/adjusted by selecting the pins a1 and a2 or the pins b1 and b2. Similarly, as shown for example in Figures 12A and 12B in the present specification as another non-limiting example, the position of the second optical system can be changed by selecting the reception piece 109 or 110.

Such features are believed to be neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied art.

In Figures 8-11 of Naiki, V-grooves 7a and 10a are provided for respective parts 10 and 20. However, Naiki is silent as to a configuration for selecting the V-grooves 7a or 10a for a single part.

According to the claims as currently written, a plurality of fixing locations are provided from which an appropriate one is selected for the purpose of solving a problem that might otherwise occur do to a condition alternative of whether or not a transparent window is inserted on a writing optical system housing, whereby a change occurs in the substantial light part length.

Naiki discloses the above-mentioned V-groove by which a collimator lens position is adjustable for the focusing adjustment. As a result, in Naiki a focus adjustment is achieved for a light source in the collimation lens, i.e., a focus error correction along the optical axis direction can be achieved. However, with such a configuration in Naiki an adjustment against an optical axis shift that occurs due to a situation alternative, i.e., whether or not a transparent window is inserted or not, cannot be achieved.

According to the claims as currently written, by providing a plurality of predetermined selectable locations for determining a location of an optical device, not only can a focus adjustment of a collimator lens and a light source be realized, but also an optical axis shift along a main or sub-scanning direction can be corrected properly. Such an advantage is not obtainable in the applied art to Naiki.

In such ways, the claims clearly distinguish over the teachings in Naiki.


Further, Naiki cannot overcome the recognized deficiencies in Kuroda for the reasons discussed above.

In such ways, each of the currently pending claims is believed to distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220

GJM:SNS\law

I:\atty\SNS\205447us-am.doc